



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/772,029	01/29/2001	Stuart G. Oxford		9141
22885	7590	04/08/2004	EXAMINER	
MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C. 801 GRAND AVENUE SUITE 3200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721			CROW, STEPHEN R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3764	5

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/772,029	OXFORD, STUART G.
Examiner	Art Unit
Steve R Crow	3764

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-15, 17-19, 21 and 23-29 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) 26 is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-8, 10-15, 17-19, 21, 23-25, 27-29 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

2. Claims 1,17-19,21,23, 25, 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tong et al.

Tong et al discloses a bouncing boot exercise device having a parabolic lower portion 12, a foot support 16 which resists motion of the user's foot.

As to claim 27, note the side and rearward straps 33.

As to claim 28, note the inverted U-shaped member 39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seel in view of Hoyle.

Seel et al discloses a body exercise device comprising a lower portion 16 which has a generally parabola shape, a foot support and retaining portion 122 at the upper end which supports and retains a person's foot therein.

Hoyle et al discloses slits 72 in a user foot platform 70 for providing straps 74 used for adjustably securing a user's foot to the platform. In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to desire to secure a user's foot to the Seel platform . This would have been accomplished by providing the Seel platform with slits which receive straps for securing the user's foot to the platform.

As to claims 2-4, note the weight retaining solid pipe rod 140 for securing weights 142.

As to claim 17, note that the lower portion is removably secured to the foot support portion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 5-7,10-15, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seel et al in view of Hoyle et al and further in view of Little.

Little shows in figures 5-6 elongated members 52 which have lower ends received by pipe stubs 50. In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the exercise art to modify the Seel et al device by substituting a hollow pipe rod which engages with an elongated rod as an obvious design variant to accommodate

more weights. Likewise, as to claim 6, the examiner contends that it also would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize elongated rods having hand grip portions as exemplified by the Little rods 70 for user safety while exercising.

As to claims 10- 15 and 24 , note the overlapping tubes 70-72 of Little ; providing a plurality of overlapping tubular members secured to a pipe stub or to arrange the attachment means at any desired position is considered an obvious variant to permit more weights to be stacked compactly.

Claims 18-19,25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seel et al in view Hoyle et al and further in view of Kost and Timko.

Seel et al states in column 5 lines 55+ that "other means to prevent slippage of the foot on the platform" can be used.

Kost teaches the use of deep recesses 40-41 on a foot platform to secure a user during exercise activity.

Timko teaches the use of shallow recesses on a platform 20 for supporting a person. In view of these teachings, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute a shallow recess for the Seel anti-slip surface to prevent foot slippage during exercise and yet be able to retain functionality of the device.

1. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seel et al in view of Hoyle et al and Little as applied to claim 5 , and further in view of Boggild.

Boggild discloses an exercise device having a flexible pole 10 for user exercise and amusement purposes. In view of this teaching , it would have been obvious

to one skilled in the art to utilize a flexible pole in the Seel et al, modified supra, device, for exercise and amusement purposes.

Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claim 26 is allowed.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve R Crow whose telephone number is 703-308-3398. The examiner can normally be reached on Reg:8:30-6;Off First Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 703-308-2698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-306-4520 for regular communications and 703-306-4520 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0873.



STEPHEN R. CROW
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 332